UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS
Washington, D.C. 20231
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/454,755	12/06/1999	SACHIKO NISHIURA	4432-19	4202

7590   06/17/2002

LAFF WHITESEL CONTE & SARET
401 NORTH MICHIGAN AVENUE
CHICAGO, IL 60611

EXAMINER
YANG, RYAN R

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2672	

DATE MAILED: 06/17/2002

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 09/454,755		Applicant(s) NISHIURA, SACHIKO	
	Examiner Ryan R Yang		Art Unit 2672	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE _3_ MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

1)☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on _28 May 2002_ .

2a)☒ This action is **FINAL**.   2b)☐ This action is non-final.

3)☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

4)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-11,13-20 and 22-27_ is/are pending in the application.

    4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.

5)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.

6)☒ Claim(s) _1,2,4-11,13-20 and 22-27_ is/are rejected.

7)☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.

8)☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

9)☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.

10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on _06 December 1999_ is/are: a)☒ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.

    Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

11)☐ The proposed drawing correction filed on _____ is: a)☐ approved b)☐ disapproved by the Examiner.

    If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply to this Office action.

12)☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120

13)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).

    a)☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:

      1.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.

      2.☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____ .

      3.☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

    * See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

14)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(e) (to a provisional application).

    a) ☐ The translation of the foreign language provisional application has been received.

15)☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for domestic priority under 35 U.S.C. §§ 120 and/or 121.

Attachment(s)

1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s). _____ .	
2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)		5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)	
3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s) _____ .		6) ☐ Other: .	

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is responsive to communications: Amendment, filed on 5/28/02. This action is final.

2.   Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-20 and 22-27 are pending in this application. Claims 1, 10 and 19 are independent claims. In the Amendment, filed on 5/28/02, claims 1, 4, 10, 13, 19 and 22 were amended, claims 3, 12 and 21 were canceled.

This application claims foreign priority dated 12/9/98.

3.   The present title of the invention is "Apparatus and Method for Converting an Object Display Description Document" as filed originally.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

4.   The text of those sections of Title 35, U.S. Code not included in this action can be found in a prior Office action.

5.   Claims 1-2, 6-11, 15-20 and 24-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as unpatentable over Politis (6,191,797) in view of Apparao et al. (6,069,633).

6.   As per claim 1, Politis discloses an apparatus for converting an object display description document, comprising a generating means for generating, from a set of source objects in the document, a set of new objects fewer than said set of source objects, to obtain a display image equivalent to the display image obtained from said set of source objects (Figure 1, where image A and B are combined in various way into a single image).

It is noted that Politis does not explicitly disclose "generating means generates a new object from a transparent or translucent source object and other source objects located at a layer lower than a layer including said transparent or translucent source object and spatially overlapping said transparent or translucent source object", however, this is known in the art as taught by Apparao et al., hereinafter Apparao. Apparao discloses a method of minimize drawing of a display area by using a compositor in which "When a transparent sprite is found, the sprite engine searches the remaining

sprites in a bottom-up manner and draws the sprites with a Z position below the

transparent sprite".

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the

invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Apparao into Politis in order to

"minimizing the redrawing of unnecessary portions of underlying ...", column 4, line 11-

12.

7.   As per claim 2, Politis and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in

the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Politis further discloses said generating

means deletes source objects hidden spatially behind another source object which is

not transparent nor translucent (Figure 1, where portion of B is deleted by overlapped

part of A in A OVER B).

8.   As per claim 6, Politis and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in

the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Politis further discloses a means for

storing said set of new objects to a storage medium (Figure 12 1206).

9.   As per claim 7, Politis and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in

the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Politis further discloses a means for

selectively storing said set of source objects or said set of new objects to a storage

medium (Figure 12 1206).

10.   As per claim 8, Politis and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in

the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Politis further discloses a means for

displaying said set of new objects, wherein said apparatus is used as a browser (Figure

12 1216 where the quadtree (a region or a portion of an image) is stored).

11.   As per claim 9, Politis and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in

the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Politis further discloses a means for

selectively displaying said set of source objects or said set of new objects, wherein said

apparatus is used as a browser (Figure 12 1216 where the quadtree is stored).

12.   As per claims 10-11 and 15-18, since Politis' and Apparao's disclosure are for a

method, apparatus and system (see Abstract of Politis) for optimizing an expressing

tree, the claims are similarly rejected as claims 1-3 and 6-9, respectively, by Politis and

Apparao.

13.   As per claims 19-20 and 24-27, since Politis' and Apparao's disclosure are used

in computer graphics, it is obvious the method can be in the form of computer program,

therefore is similarly rejected as claims 1-3 and 6-9, respectively, by Politis and

Apparao.

14.   Claims 1-2, 4-11, 13-20 and 22-27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

unpatentable over Berend et al. (5,692,117) in view of Apparao et al. (6,069,633).

        As per claim 1, Berend et al., hereinafter Berend, discloses an apparatus for

converting an object display description document, comprising a generating means for

generating, from a set of source objects in the document, a set of new objects fewer

than said set of source objects, to obtain a display image equivalent to the display

image obtained from said set of source objects (Figure 62a and 62b where 62a shows

two overlapping objects and 62b shows combined object has fewer source objects than

62a).

        It is noted that Berend does not explicitly disclose "generating means generates

a new object from a transparent or translucent source object and other source objects

located at a layer lower than a layer including said transparent or translucent source

object and spatially overlapping said transparent or translucent source object", however,

this is known in the art as taught by Apparao et al., hereinafter Apparao. Apparao

discloses a method of minimize drawing of a display area by using a compositor in which "When a transparent sprite is found, the sprite engine searches the remaining sprites in a bottom-up manner and draws the sprites with a Z position below the transparent sprite".

Thus, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the teaching of Apparao into Berend in order to "minimizing the redrawing of unnecessary portions of underlying ...", column 4, line 11-12.

15.   As per claim 2, Berend and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Berend further discloses said generating means deletes source objects hidden spatially behind another source object which is not transparent nor translucent (Figure 62a and 62b, "to cause the overlapping portions of the outline curves not to be displayed ... so that the overlapping sections of each boundary curve are rendered invisible when displayed", column 51, line 21-30).

16.   As per claim 4, Berend and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of dependent claim 1, supra, and Berend further discloses generation of said new object from said transparent or translucent source object and said other source objects is performed for a time range in which said transparent or translucent source object spatially overlaps said other source objects ("Another type of amendment involves moving a frame or a series of frames in time ... and to generate new intervening frames (or delete old frames) as required", column 20, line 39-47).

17.   As per claim 5, Berend and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Berend further discloses said generating means deletes a source object when a display time for said source object is out of a display time range for said set of source objects ("Another type of amendment involves moving a frame or a series of frames in time ... and to generate new intervening frames (or delete old frames) as required", column 20, line 39-47).

18.   As per claim 6, Berend and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Berend further discloses a means for storing said set of new objects to a storage medium (Figure 3 120).

19.   As per claim 7, Berend and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Berend further discloses a means for selectively storing said set of source objects or said set of new objects to a storage medium (Figure 3 120).

20.   As per claim 8, Berend and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Berend further discloses a means for displaying said set of new objects, wherein said apparatus is used as a browser (Figure 5, where the animator workstations 110a ... 110c can retrieve data from file server 180).

21.   As per claim 9, Berend and Apparao demonstrated all the elements as applied in the rejection of independent claim 1, supra, and Berend further discloses a means for selectively displaying said set of source objects or said set of new objects, wherein said apparatus is used as a browser (Figure 5, where the animator workstations 110a ... 110c can selectively retrieve data from file server 180).

22.   As per claims 10-11 and 13-18, since Berend's and Apparao's disclosure are for a method and apparatus for producing animated drawing, the claims are similarly rejected as claims 1-2 and 4-9, respectively, by Berend and Apparao.

23.   As per claims 19-20 and 22-27, since Berend's and Apparao's disclosure are used in computer animation, it is obvious the method can be in the form of computer program, therefore is similarly rejected as claims 1-2 and 4-9, respectively, by Berend and Apparao.

Response to Arguments

24.   Applicant's arguments with respect to claims 1, 10 and 19 have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

Conclusion

25.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Inquiries

26.   Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Ryan Yang** whose telephone number is **(703) 308-6133**.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Michael Razavi**, can be reached at **(703) 305-4713**.

   Any response to this action should be mailed to:
         Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
         Washington, D.C. 20231
   or faxed to:
         (703) 872-9314 (for Technology Center 2600 only)
   Hand-delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Park II, 2121 Crystal Drive, Arlington, VA, Sixth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding should be directed to the Technology Center 2600 Customer Service Office whose telephone number is (703) 306-0377.

Ryan Yang
June 7, 2002

MICHAEL RAZAVI
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600